

No. 9(1)81-6 Lab/14796.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Sono Electricals Private Limited Sector 24, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ PRESIDING OFFICER INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 318 of 1981

between

SHRI KAMAL SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. SONO
ELECTRICALS PRIVATE LIMITED SECTOR 24 FARIDABAD

Present

None for the workman.
Shri R. S. Aora for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/122/81/47887, dated 18th September, 1981 the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Sono Electricals Private Limited Sector 24, Faridabad and its workman Shri Kamal Singh, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Kamal Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the orders of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The representative for the management appeared but the workman did not appear despite service. On the next date the representative for the management produced full and final settlement Exhibit M-1. In view of the settlement filed by the management I give my award that the workman has settled the dispute with the management and there is no dispute pending for adjudication.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated the 3rd December, 1981.

No. 1134, dated 10th December, 1981.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana Labour and Employment Departments Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)81-6 Lab/14798.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Esskay Textiles, NIT Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ PRESIDING OFFICER INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 255 of 1981

between

SHRI TARA CHAND WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. ESSKAY
TEXTILES NIT FARIDABAD

Present.—

Workman in person.
None for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/94/81/36904, dated 11th August, 1981, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Esskey Textiles NIT Faridabad and its workman Shri Tara Chand, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Tara Chand was justified and in order ? If so, what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices, were issued to the parties. The workman appeared but the management did not appear. The management was proceeded against *ex-parte*. And the case was fixed for *ex-parte* evidence of the workman. The in his *ex parte* statement stated he was working with the management as helper with effect from 20th June, 1980. The management was giving less minimum wages. The management stopped his gate without any reason. No termination letter was given by the management. He was drawing Rs. 180. No enquiry was held against him,

Believing *ex-parte* statement of the workman I give my award that the termination of services of the workman was neither justified, nor in order. The workman is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and with full back wages. I order accordingly.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated the 3rd December, 1981.

No. 1133, dated 10th December, 1981.]

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 4th January, 1982

No. 9(1)-81/6Lab.14805.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following Arbitration award of Shri Dharmendra Nath, Deputy Labour Commissioner, Faridabad (Sole Arbitrator) in respect of the dispute between the management of M/s Northern India Iron and Steel Co. Ltd. 20/3, Mathura Road, Faridabad and their workers through Northern India and Steel Employees Union, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI DHARMENDRA NATH, DEPUTY LABOUR COMMISSIONER,
FARIDABAD (SOLE ARBITRATOR)

IN THE MATTER OF AN INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE

between

THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. NORTHERN INDIA IRON AND STEEL CO. LTD.,
20/3, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD AND THEIR WORKMEN THROUGH
NORTHERN INDIA & STEEL EMPLOYEES UNION, FARIDABAD

Appearances—

1. Shri K.P. Aggarwal for the management.
2. Sri Diwan Gandhi alongwith Shri Salig Ram for the workmen.

AWARD

An industrial dispute having come into existence between the management of M/s Northern India Iron and Steel Co. Ltd., Faridabad and their workmen through Northern India and Steel Employees Union (Regd.), Faridabad, the parties agreed to refer the dispute to my arbitration under section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the Haryana Government then published the arbitration agreement,—*vide* their notification No. ID/FD/61/81/56019, dated 13th November, 1981. The specific matter in the dispute which is mentioned in the said agreement runs as under :—

What should be the quantum of Bonus for the accounting year 1980-81 ?

After the agreement was published in the Gazette, usual notices were issued to the parties. In compliance thereto, the parties put in their appearances and thereafter proceedings were taken on different dates. The management have brought on record copies of balance-sheets and Profit and Loss accounts for the accounting years 1979-80 and 1980-81. They have also placed on record Directors' reports for the accounting years aforesaid.

Since the Profit and Loss Accounts and Balance Sheets which have been brought on record stand duly audited by qualified Auditors as required under sub-section (1) of section 226 of the Company's Act, 1956. I accordingly presume the statements and particulars contained therein to be accurate. Moreover the opposite party has also not raised any objection in respect of the accuracy or correctness of these documents.

I have given my careful consideration to the material placed on record and the arguments advanced by the parties. I have also applied my mind to the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), prescribing the mode of computation of gross profit. I have also made my own calculations to derive the amount of allocable surplus as defined under sub-section (4) of section 2 of the Act and as stipulated in the third schedule specified under section 6 of the Act. Thus taking into consideration all the factors laid down under the Act, I am of the opinion that the workers are entitled to bonus payment for the accounting year 1980-81 @ 17% of the wages plus dearness allowance. Further there was a common ground between the parties that production and efficiency of the Plant needs to be improved for the overall prosperity and growth of the Organisation and that there is ample scope on behalf of the workmen to improve their part of contribution in this regard. In this way I direct the management that in addition of bonus @ 17% of the wages another payment in the shape of *ex-gratia* bonus @ 1.35% of the wages should also be made to all the eligible workers. This *ex-gratia* bonus is being directed to be paid so that production, productivity, discipline and overall efficiency of the Plant should register positive improvement during the coming months. The reference is answered accordingly.

Dated the 3rd December, 1981.

DHARMENDR ANATH,
Deputy Labour Commissioner,
Faridabad
(Sole Arbitrator).

Endorsement No. _____ dated _____

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

DHARMENDRA NATH,
Deputy Labour Commissioner,
Faridabad
(Sole Arbitrator).

The 12th January, 1982

No. 9(1)81-6Lab/14853.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s S.J. Knitting and Finishing Mills, 13/9, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 18 of 1981

between

SHRI RAM BALI WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S S. J. KNITTING AND FINISHING MILLS, 13/9, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Appearances :

Shri H. P. Singh, for the workman.
Shri B. R. Grover for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 18 of 1981 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, — vide his order No. ID/FD/249-80/65182, dated 26th December, 1980 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Ram Bali workman and the management of M/s S. J. Knitting and Finishing Mills, 13/9, Mathura Road, Faridabad. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Bali was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, the issues were framed on 27th July, 1981. On 18th November, 1981, the date fixed in the case, the representative of the workman stated that he had no instructions from the workman. So he does not want to pursue his case. In view of the above statement of the representative of the workman, I feel that neither the workman nor his representative is interested to pursue this reference. So I hold that there is no dispute between the parties and reference is bad in law. No order as to costs, I give my award accordingly.

Dated 2nd December, 1981.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 3422, dated 11th December, 1981

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)-81-6Lab./14857.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Shambhoo Nath and Sons Ltd., Shahbad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH, KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 126 of 1981

between

SHRI D. S. REKHI, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT MANAGEMENT OF M/S. SHAMBHOO
NATH AND SONS LTD., SHAHBAD.

Present :

None, for the workman.

Shri Jagbir Singh for the respondent management.

AWARD

This reference No. 126 of 1981 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, — vide his order No. ID/Amb/160-80/12043, dated 16th March, 1981, under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, existing between Shri D. S. Rekhi, workman and the respondent management of M/s. Shambhoo Nath and Sons, Ltd., Shahbad. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri D. S. Rekhi was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference notices were sent to the parties for 21st July, 1981. On that day the workman was present, but none was present from the side of the respondent, despite service. It was already 12.50 p. m. and I proceeded *ex-parte* against the management. Then the case was fixed for *ex-parte* evidence of the workman on 21st August, 1981, at Yamuna Nagar. On 21st August, 1981 the workman sent a telegram for adjournment, which was granted and the case was adjourned to 20th October, 1981 for *ex-parte* evidence of the workman. On that day none was present from the side of the workman and on the very same day the management filed an application for setting aside the *ex-parte* proceeding dated 21st July, 1981. Arguments on this application were heard and the *ex-parte* order was set aside. I waited upto 12.30 P. M. and proceeded *ex-parte* against the workman and on the same day *ex-parte* evidence of the management was recorded.

Shri B. N. Khandelwal, Secretary of the respondent company appeared as MW-1, who stated that the claimant was never employed by the respondent. He was only their Labour Law Advisor, who impart legal advise to their company. So the claimant did not cover under the definition of workman nor any relation of master and servant exist between the parties. He further stated that the claimant was working as Labour Law Advisor in other companies also.

In view of the un-rebutted *ex-parte* evidence produced by the management. I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. I feel that the claimant was only Labour Law Advisor of the company, who did not do any regular duty in the respondent company. He only impart his advise to the company in labour law. In these circumstances, I hold that the claimant is not cover under the definition of workman. So the reference is bad in law and the claimant is not entitled to any relief.

No order as to costs. This be read as answer to this reference.

Dated, the 9th December, 1981

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endstt. No. 3414, dated the 11th December, 1981.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1) 81-6 Lab./14861.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Amar Pali Strctural Pvt. Ltd., 14/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH, KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 262 of 1981

between

SHRI BAIJUL WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S AMAR PALI STRUCTURAL
PRIVATE LIMITED, 14/7, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Workman with Shri Mohit Kumar Bhandari.

None for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This reference No. 262 of 1981 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, vide his order No. ID/FD/138/81/50937, dated 7th October, 1981, under section 10 (1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, existing between Shri Baijul, workman and the management of M/s. Amar Pali Structural Pvt. Ltd, 14/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad. The terms of the reference was:

Whether termination of services of Shri Baijul was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties for 18th November, 1981. On that day workman was present along with his representative, but none was present from the side of the management. Service of the notice has been effected on the management. The case was called thrice. It was already 1-30 p.m. In these circumstances, I proceed *ex-parte* against the management and the case was fixed for recording of *ex-parte* evidence of the workman for 25th November, 1981. On 25th November, 1981 *ex-parte* evidence of the workman was not recorded as his representative was ill and prayed for a date, which was granted and the case was fixed for recording of *ex-parte* evidence for 30th November, 1981. On that day *ex-parte* evidence of workman was recorded.

The workman appeared himself as WW-1 in the Court, who stated that he was working with the respondent company from 1st January, 1980 as Helper at the rate of Rs. 300 p.m. The respondent management terminated his service on 2nd June, 1981, without assigning any reason or giving any notice. He further stated that he was permanent employee of the respondent company and his work during his tenure was quite satisfactory. He prayed that he be re-instated with full back wages and continuity of service as he was un-employed from the date of his termination.

Keeping in view the circumstances of the case, I see no reason why the un-rebutted *ex-parte* evidence of the workman given on oath should not be believed especially when the management chose not to appear and defend this reference before this Court. So I believing the statement of the workman hold that the termination of services of the workman was not justified and in order and the workman is entitled for his re-instatement with full back wages and continuity of service. No order as to costs.

This be read in answer to this reference.

Dated, the 9th December, 1981.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 3411, dated 11th December, 1981.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9 (1)81-6Lab./14862. -- In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and management of M/s Amar Pali structural Pvt. Ltd., 14/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad:

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH, KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER,
LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 255 of 1981.

between

SHRI VAID NATH RAI, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT MANAGEMENT
OF M/S. AMAR PALI STRUCTURAL PRIVATE LIMITED, 14/7,
MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD.

Workman with Shri Mohit Kumar Bhandari.

None for the respondent, management.

AWARD

This reference No. 355 of 1981 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. JD/Dr/186/48576, dated 25th September, 1981, under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, existing between Shri Vaid Nath Rai, workman and the respondent management of M/s. Amar Pali Structural Private Limited, 14/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad. The terms of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Vaid Nath Rai, was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties for 26th October, 1981. On that day the workman was present along with his representative, but none, was present from the side of the management. Service of the notice has been effected on the management. The case was called thrice. It was already 1.30 p. m. In these circumstances, I proceeded *ex-parte* against the management, and the case was fixed for recording of *ex-parte* evidence of the workman for 18th November, 1981. On that day the *ex-parte* evidence of the workman was recorded.

The workman appeared as WW-1 in this Court, who stated that he was appointed as helper on 1st January, 1980 at the rate of Rs. 300 per month. At the time of his recruitment no appointment letter was given by the respondent. The respondent terminated his services on 2nd June, 1981 without assigning any reason or giving any charge-sheet. After that he served a demand notice, dated 16th June, 1981. He further stated that he sent a letter to the respondent on 2nd July, 1981, through UPC. The copy of the letter is Ex. W-1 and UPC receipt is Ex. W-2, but the respondent did not allow to join his duty nor they gave any reply to this letter. He prayed that he be reinstated with full back wages and continuity of service as he is un-employed from the date of his termination.

Keeping in view the circumstances of the case, I see no reason why the un-rebutted *ex-parte* evidence of the workman given on oath should not be believed especially when the management chose not to appear and defend this reference before this Court. So I believing the statement of the workman hold that the termination of the services of the workman was not justified and in order and the workman is entitled for his reinstatement with full back wages and continuity of service. No order as to costs.

This be read in answer to this reference.

Dated 9th December, 1981

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 3410, dated 11th December, 1981

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 9(1)81-6 Lab./14866.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Polymer Papers Ltd., 12/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 281 of 1981

between

SHRI BRIJA NAND, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S POLYMER
PAPERS LTD., 12/6, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Shri Mohit Kumar Bhandari, for the workman.

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 281 of 1981 has been referred this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, vide his order No. ID/FD/186/81/53017, dated 23rd October, 1981, under section 10 (1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Bijra Nand, workman and the management of M/s Polymer Papers Limited, 12/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad. The term of reference was: —

Whether the termination of services of Shri Brijra Nand was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties. The parties appeared and made their statement on 26th November, 1981. The representative of the workman stated that he had no instructions from the workman to pursue his case. On the other hand, the representative of the management stated that the workman Shri Brijra Nand had settled his case with the management and also received a sum of Rs. 2,250 in full and final settlement including the right of re-instatement or re-employment. He also filed the photo copies of resignation of the workman, settlement and receipt of voucher which are Ex. M-1, 2 and 3. He further stated that there is no dispute or claim between the parties.

In view of the above statement of the parties, I hold that the workman had settled his case with the management and also received a sum of Rs. 2,250 in full and final settlement including the right of re-instatement or re-employment and there is no dispute between the parties. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad

Dated, the 3rd December, 1981.

Endorsement No. 3406, dated the 11th December, 1981.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the abovesaid award may please be acknowledged within weeks' time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)81-6Lab./14871.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Golden Textile Products, G. T. Road, Panipat.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 77 of 1981

between

SHRI SUMER CHAND, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. GOLDEN TEXTILE PRODUCTS, G. T. ROAD, PANIPAT

Present .—

Shri Karan Singh, for the workman.

Shri S. Kaushal, for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 77 of 1981 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, vide his order No. ID/KNL/72-80/7937, dated 13th February, 1981 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Sumer Chand, workman and the management of M/s Golden Textile Products, G. T. Road, Panipat. The term of the reference was :—

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Sumer Chand was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?"

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties. The parties appeared. On 17th November, 1981 the date fixed in the case, the representative of the workman made a statement in this court that the workman had settled his case with the management. He also filed the copy of settlement, which is Ex. W-1. He further stated that he does not want to pursue his case and withdrawn the same. This statement was duly admitted by the representative of the management. In view of the above statement made by the parties, I hold that the workman had settled his case according to the settlement Ex. W-1. There is no dispute between the parties. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

Dated, the 22nd December, 1981.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 3401, dated 11th December, 1981.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to the Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the above said award may pleased be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 22nd January, 1982

No.9(1)82-61ab/168.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Nagpal Textile Mills, G.T. Road, Panipat :—

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 66 of 1980

between

SMT. MAYA DEVI, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S NAGPAL TEXTILE
MILLS, G T. ROAD, PANIPAT

Present :—

Shri Raghubir Singh, for the workman.

Shri, Ranbir Singh, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/KNL/110/80/57456, dated the 21st November, 1980, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Nagpal Textile Mills, G T. Road, Panipat and its workman Smt. Maya Devi, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Smt. Maya Devi was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is she entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed and the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management examined one witness and closed its case. The workman examined one witness and then the case was fixed for remaining evidence of the workman. But on 18th November, 1981, the parties arrived at a settlement. According to the settlement the management agreed to pay a sum of Rs. 2,000 to the workman in full and final settlement, if she withdrew her case. In view of the statements given by the parties, I give my award that the management shall pay a sum of Rs. 2,000 to the workman in full and final settlement.

Dated, the 10th December, 1981.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1157, dated the 23rd December, 1981

Forwarded four copies to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 28th January, 1982

No. 9/(1)82-6-Lab/276.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Polymer Papers Ltd. 12/6, Mathura Road Faridabad :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KUAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER,
LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No 267 of 1981

between

SHRI SIYA RAM SHARMA WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. POLYMER
LIMITED, 12/6 MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD.

Shri Mohit Kumar Bhandari for the workman.
Shri R. C. Sharma for the Management.

AWARD

This reference No. 267 of 1981 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/167/81/50931, dated 7th October, 1981 under section (10) (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Siya Ram Sharma workmen and the management of M/s Polymer Papers Limited, 12/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Siya Ram Sharma was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties. The parties appeared. On 18th December, 1981, the representative of the management made a statement in this Court that the workman had settled his case with the management and also received a sum of Rs. 1,900/- in full and final settlement of his all claims or dispute including the right of reinstatement or re-employment. The photo copy of settlement is Ex. M-1. He also filed the photo copy of receipt voucher is Ex. M-4. The other documents are Ex. M-2 and M-3. He further stated that there is no dispute between the parties. This statement was duly admitted by the representative of the workman. In view of the above statement of the parties, I hold that there is no dispute between the parties and the workman had also received a sum of Rs. 1,900/- in full and final accounts. I give my award accordingly. No orders as to costs.

Dated, the 1st January, 1982.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 4 dated the 4th January, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above-said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.